

**REMARKS**

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner has required restriction between the claims of:


Group I - Claims 1-3, and

Group II - Claims 4-9.

Applicant hereby elects for prosecution, Group I, Claims 1-3 with traverse.

Applicant believes the restriction requirement to be improper insofar as the claims of the apparatus and the claims of the method are so interlinked as to require that searching be conducted in identical classes. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden, even though Applicant agrees that the two enumerated inventions may be independent and distinct. Therefore, pursuant to MPEP Section 803, the Examiner should examine the entire application on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WELSH & KATZ, LTD.**



Gerald T. Shekleton  
Registration No. 27,466

Dated: **July 25, 2006**  
**WELSH & KATZ, LTD.**  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
22nd Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3912  
Telephone: (312) 655-1500  
Facsimile: (312) 655-1501